The Pittsburgh Gazette

Vol. XVI. *Friday Evening*, April 23, 1802. No. 816

PITTSBURGH: PRINTED BY JOHN SCULL, *IN FRONT-STREET, NEXT DOOR TO THE CORNER OF MARKET-STREET.*

Terms of Subscription for the PITTSBURGH GAZETTE.——*Two Dollars a year—One Dollar to be paid at the time of subscribing, the other at the end of Six months, if demanded [When sent by post the postage must be paid in addition, at the Post-Office where the papers are left.]*

ADVERTISEMENTS—*not exceeding a square inserted three weeks for One Dollar, and every continuance after 25 Cents.—Those of a greater length in proportion.*

MERCHANDIZE.

To be Sold by Auction,
By order of the Assignees of Gazzam, Taylor and Jones, at the house of the subscriber, at 9 o'clock, on MONDAY the 26th instant, and the following days,
a variety of

Hardware, Dry Goods, Queensware and Groceries.

EBENEZER DENNY.

Pittsburgh, April 15, 1802.

New (Coal-Hill) Road.

A NEW Road is just opened leading from Nicholas Bausman's to Pittsburgh, crossing the River at Gregg's Ferry, about a quarter or half mile above the town, at the head of the Sand-barr. This Road, by the measurement of an experienced Surveyor, is three quarters of a mile nearer than the old one, and the whole of it exceeding good; the descent down the Coal-Hill is very gradual, so that full loaded waggons can pass and repass with as perfect ease as they can any other common road.—— A singular and great advantage that will attend the Ferry is, that the passage across will not be obstructed by the Sand barr, and the river narrower than opposite the town. The Ferry will be conducted by Mr. Samuel Emmitt, who has opened a house of Public Entertainment on the south side of the river. From a short acquaintance with Mr. Emmitt the public will find that he is well calculated for the business, and worthy of their patronage.

April 15, 1802.

Sheriff's Sales.

BY virtue of a writ of Testatum Venditioni Exponas to me directed, out of the Court of Common Pleas of Westmoreland County, will be exposed to Sale on Saturday the 8th day of May next, at the Court House in the Borough of Pittsburgh,

A certain Tract of Land and Tenements containing 474 acres, more or less, situate in Fayette township, about 10 miles from Pittsburgh, adjoining lands of Moses Middlesworth, Gilson, Christian Lesnet, and others. Taken in execution as the property of John Campbell, deceased, at the suit of James O'Hara.

WILLIAM WUSTHOFF, Sheriff.

Pittsburgh, April 12, 1802.

BY virtue of a writ of Venditioni Exponas to me directed, out of the Court of Common Pleas, will be exposed to Sale at the Court House in the Borough of Pittsburgh, on Saturday the 8th of May next, the following real estate, viz.

One Lot or piece of Ground No. 97, one Lot or piece of Ground adjoining the same—also, one half Lot or piece of Ground, No. 174, situated in M'Kee's Port. Taken in execution as the property of Joseph Patterson, at the suit of Henry Major.

WILLIAM WUSTHOFF, Sheriff.

Pittsburgh, April 15, 1802.

Six Cents Reward.

ON Sunday morning last, JAMES WELSH an Apprentice, about 15 years of age, ran from the subscriber, living at the corner of Market and Front Streets; he is supposed to have gone towards the east. Any person that will bring said Apprentice to his master, shall receive the above reward paid in cash.

THOMAS DOBBINS, Cabinet Maker.

Pittsburgh, 14th April, 1802.

REPEAL OF THE JUDICIARY LAW.

(Mr. BAYARD's Speech continued.)

I OWE to the committee the expression of thanks for the patience with which they attended to the laborious discussion of yesterday.

It will be my endeavour in the remarks which I have to offer upon the remaining point of the debate, to consume no time which the importance of the subject does not justify. I have never departed from the question before the committee, but with great reluctance. Before I heard the gentleman from Virginia, I had not an observation to make unconnected with the bill on the table. It was he who forced me to wander on foreign ground, and be assured, sir, I shall be guilty of no new digressions, where I am not covered by the same justification.

I did think that this was an occasion when the house ought to have been liberated from the dominion of party spirit, and allowed to decide upon the unbiassed dictates of their own undersatnding. The vain hope which I indulged that this course would be pursued was soon dissipated by the inflammatory appeal made by the gentleman from Virginia, to the passions of his party. This appeal, which treated with no respect the feelings of one side of the house, will excuse recriminations which have been made, or which shall be retorted. We were disposed to conciliate, but gentlemen are deceived if they think that we will submit to be trampled on.

I shall now, sir, proceed to the consideration of the second point which the subject presents. However this point may be disguised by subtleties, I conceive the true question to be—has the legislature a right by law to vacate the office of a judge? But, as in fact they remove the judges, they are bound to answer our question.

The question which I state they will not meet. Nay, I have considered it as conceded upon all hands, that the legislature have not the power of removing a judge from his office; but it is contended only that the office may be taken from the judge. Sir, it is a principle in law, which ought, and I apprehend does, hold more strongly in politics; that what is prohibited from being done directly is restrained from being done indirectly. Is there any difference but in words between taking the office from a judge and removing the judge from the office? Do you not indirectly accomplish the end, which you admit is prohibited? I will not say that it is the sole intention of the supporters of the bill before us, to remove the circuit judges from their offices; but I will say that they establish a precedent, which will enable worse men than themselves to make use of the legislative power for that purpose upon any occasion. If it be constitutional to vacate the office, and in that way to dismiss the judge, can there be a question as to the power to re-create the office and to fill it with another man? Repeal to-day the bill of the last session, and the circuit judges are no longer in office. To-morrow rescind the repealing act (and no one will doubt the right to do it) and no effect is produced but the removal of the judges. To suppose that such a case may occur is no vagary of imagination. The thing has been done, shamelessly done in a neighbouring state. The judges there held their offices upon the same tenure with the judges of the United States. Three of them were obnoxious to the men in power. The judicial law of the state was repealed, and immediately re-enacted without a veil being thrown over the transaction. The obnoxious men were removed, their places supplied with new characters, and the other judges re-appointed. Whatever sophistry may be able to shew in theory, in practice there never will be found a difference in the exercise of the powers of removing a judge and of vacating his office.

The question, which we are now considering, depends upon the provisions contained in the constitution. It is an error of the committee, upon plain subjects to search for reasons very profound. Upon the present subject the strong provisions of the constitution are so obvious, that no eye can overlook them. They have been repeatedly cited, and as long as the question stated is under discussion, they must be reiterated. There are two prominent provisions to which I now particularly allude. 1st. The judges shall hold their offices during good behavior. 2d. Their compensation shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.—These are provisions so clearly understood upon the first impression, that their meaning is rather obscured than illustrated by argument. What is meant, and what has been universally understood by the tenure of "good behaviour?" *A tenure for life*, if the judge commit no misdemeanor. It is so understood and expressed in England and so it has always been received and admitted in this country. The *express* provision then of the constitution defines the tenure of a judge's office; a tenure during life. How is that tenure *expressly* qualified? By the good behavior of the judge. Is the tenure qualified by any other *express* condition of limitation? No other. As the tenure is *express*, as but one *express* limitation is imposed upon it, can it be subject to any other limitation not derived from necessary implication. If any material provision in the constitution can in no other manner be satisfied than by subjecting the tenure of their office to some new condition, I will then admit that the tenure is subject to the condition.

Gentlemen have ventured to point out a provision which they conceived furnished this necessary implication. They refer to the power given to Congress from time to time to establish courts inferior to the supreme court. If this power cannot be exercised without vacating the offices of existing judges, I will concede that those offices may be vacated. But on this head there can be no controversy. The power has been, and at all times may, be exercised without vacating the office of any judge. It was so exercised at the last session of Congress; and I surely do not now dispute the right of gentlemen to establish as many new courts as they may deem expedient. The power to establish new courts does not therefore necessarily imply a power to abolish the offices of existing judges, because the existence of those offices does not prevent an execution of the power.

The clause in the constitution to which I have just alluded has furnished to gentlemen their famous position, that though you cannot remove a judge from his office, you may take the office from the judge. Though I should be in order, I will not call this a quibble, but I shall attempt, in the course of the argument, yet more clearly to prove that it is one. I do not contend that you cannot abolish an empty office, but the point on which I rely is, that you can do no act which impairs the independence of a judge. When gentlemen assert that the office may be vacated notwithstanding the incumbancy of a judge, do they consider that they beg the very point which is in controversy. The office cannot be vacated without violating the express provision of the constitution in relation to the tenure.

The judge is to hold the office during good behavior. Does he hold it when it is taken from him? Has the constitution said, that he shall hold the office during good behavior, unless Congress shall deem it expedient to abolish the office? If this limitation has been omitted, what authority have we to make it a part of the constitution?

The second plain, unequivocal provision, on this subject is, that the compensation of the judge shall not be diminished during the time he continues in office. This provision is directly levelled at the power of the legislature. They alone could reduce the salary. Could this provision have any other design than to place the judge out of the power of Congress; and yet how imperfect and how absurd the plan. You cannot reduce a part of the compensation, but you may extinguish the whole. What is the sum of this notable reasoning? You cannot remove the judge from the office, but you may take the office from the judge. You cannot take the compensation from the judge, but you may separate the judge from the compensation.

If your constitution cannot resist reasoning like this, then indeed it is waste paper.

I will here turn aside, in order to consider a variety of arguments drawn from different sources, on which gentlemen on the other side have placed a reliance. I know of no order in which they can be classed, and I shall therefore take them up as I meet with them on my notes. It was urged by the honorable member from Virginia, to whom I have so frequently referred, that what was created by law, might by law be annihilated. In the application of his principle, he disclosed views which I believe, have not yet been contemplated by gentlemen of his party. He was industrious to shew that not only the inferior courts, but the supreme court derives its existence from law. The president and legislature exist under the constitution. They came into being without the aid of a law. But though the constitution said, there shall be a supreme court, no judges could exist till the court was organized by a law. This argument, I presume, was pushed to this extent in order to give notice to the judges of the supreme court of their fate, and to bid them prepare for their end.

I shall not attempt to discriminate between the tenure of the offices of the judges of the supreme and inferior courts. Congress has power to organize both descriptions of courts, and to limit the number of judges, *but they have no power to limit or define the tenure of office.* Congress creates the office; the president appoints the officer, but it is neither under Congress or the president, but under the constitution, that the judge claims to hold the office during good behavior. The principle asserted does not in this case apply; the tenure of office is not created by law, and if the truth of the principle were admitted, it would not follow, that the tenure of the office might be vacated by law. But the principle is not sound.—I will shew a variety of cases which will prove its falacy. Among the obnoxious measures of the late administration, was the loan of five millions, which was funded at eight per cent. The loan was created by a law, and funded by law. Is the gentleman prepared to say, that this debt, which was funded by a law of the former legislature, may be extinguished by a law of the present. Can you, by calling the interest of this debt exorbitant and usurious, justify the reduction of it? Gentlemen admit that the salary of a judge, though established by law, cannot be diminished by a law. The same thing must be allowed with respect to the salary of the President. Sir, the true principle is that one legislature may repeal the act of a former, in cases not prohibited by the constitution. The correct question therefore is whether the legislature are not forbidden by the constitution to abridge the tenure of a judicial office?

In order to avoid cases of a nature similar to those which I have put, the gentleman from Kentucky, (Mr. Davis) and after him the gentleman from Virginia, endeavoured to draw a distinction between laws executed and laws executory.

The distinction was illustrated by reference to the case of a state admitted by law into the union. Here it is said the law is executed, and *functus officio*, and if you repeal it, still the state remains a member of the union. But it was asked by the gentleman from Kentucky, supposing a law made to admit a state into the union, at a future time, before the time of admission arrived, could not the law be repealed. I will answer the question to the satisfaction of the gentleman, by stating a case which exists. By an ordinance of Congress, in the year 1787, Congress ordained, that when the population within the limits of a state within the North Western Territory, should amount to 60,000 souls—the district should be admitted as a member of the union. Will the gentleman venture to doubt as to this case. Would he dare to tell the people of this country, that Congress had the power to disfranchise them.

The law, in the case I refer to, is executory, though the event upon which it is to take effect is limitted by population and not by time.

But, sir, if there were any thing in the principle, it has no influence upon the case to which it has been applied. A law has created the office of a judge, the judge has been appointed and the office filled. The law is therefore executed, and upon the very distinction of the gentleman, cannot be repealed. The law fixing the compensation is executory, and so is that which establishes the salary of the President, but though e

ecutory, they cannot be repealed. The distinction therefore is idle, and leaves the question upon the ground of the repeal being permitted or prohibited by the constitution. I shall now advert, sir, to an argument urged with great force and not a little triumph by the honorable member from Virginia.—This argument is derived from the word 'hold' in the expression the judge shall *hold* his office during good behavior. It is considered as correlative to tenure. The gentleman remarks, that the constitution provides, that the president shall nominate the judge to his office, and approved by the senate, shall commission him. It is hence inferred, that as the president nominates and commissions the judge, the judge *holds* the office of the president; and that when the constitution provides, that the tenure of the office shall be during good behavior, the provision applies to the President, and restrains the power which otherwise would result in consequence of the offices being *holden* of him, to remove the judges at will. This is an argument, sir, which I should have tho't that the honorable member would have been the last person upon this floor to have adopted. It not only imputes to the president royal attributes, but prerogatives, derived from the rude doctrine of the feudal law.—Does the gentleman mean to contend, that the president of these states, like the monarch of England, is the fountain of honor, of justice, and of office? Does he mean to contend, that the courts are the President's courts, and the judges the President's judges? Does he mean to say, sir, that the chief magistrate is always supposed to be present in these courts, and that the judges are but the images of his justice? To serve the paltry purposes of this argument, would the gentleman be willing to infuse into our constitution, the vital spirit of the feudal doctrines? He does not believe, he cannot believe, that when the word 'hold' was employed, any reference was had to its feudal import. The language of the constitution furnishes no support to this feudal argument. These officers are not called the judges of the president, but the judges of the United States. They are a branch of the government equally important, and designed to be co-ordinate with the President, If, sir, because the President nominates to office and commissions, the office is held of him, for a stronger reason where by patent he grants lands of the United States, the lands are held of him. And upon the grantee's dying without heirs, the lands would escheat not to the United States, but to the President. In England, the tenure of lands and offices is derived from the same principle.—All lands are held mediately, or immediately of the crown, because they are supposed to have been originally acquired from the personal grant of the monarch. It is the same of office, as the king is supposed to be the source of all offices. Having the power to grant, he has a right to define the terms of the grant. These terms constitute the tenure. When the terms fail, the tenure ceases, and the object of the grant reverts to the grantor. This gentleman has charged others with monarchical tendencies, but never have I before witnessed an attempt so bold and strong to incorporate in our constitution, a rank monarchical principle. If, sir, the principle of our constitution on this subject be republican and not monarchical, and the judges hold their offices of the United States, and not of the President, then the application of his argument has all the force against the gentleman which he designed it should have against his adversaries. For if the office be held of the United States, and the tenure of good behavior was designed to restrain the power of those of whom the office was holden, it will follow, that it was the intention to restrain the United States.

We were told by an honorable gentleman from Virginia, who rose early in the dedate, (Mr. Thompson) that the principles we advocated tended to establish a sinecure system in the country. Sir, I am as little disposed to be accessary to the establishment of such a system as any gentleman on this floor. But let me ask how this system is to be produced? We established judicial offices, to which numerous and important duties were assigned. A compensation has been allowed to the judges, which no one will say is immoderate, or disproportioned to the service to be rendered. These gentlemen first abolish the duties of the offices, and then call the judges pensioners, and afterwards accuse us of establishing sinecures. There are no pensioners at present; if there should be any, they will be the creatures of this law. I have ever considered it as a sound and moral maxim, that no one should avail himself of his own wrong. It is a maxim, which ought to be equally obligatory upon the public as upon the private man. In the present case, the judge offers you his service. You cannot say, it is not worth the money you pay for it. You refuse to accept the service; and after engaging to pay him while he continued to perform the service, you deny him the compensation, because he neglects to render services which you have prevented him from performing. Was injustice ever more flagrant? Surely, sir, the judges are innocent. If we do wrong, why should they be punished and disgraced? They did not pass the obnoxious law, they did not create the offices, they had no participation in the guilty business; but they were invited upon the faith of government to renounce their private professions, to relinquish the emoluments of other employments, and to enter into the service of the United States, who engaged to retain them during their lives, if they were guilty of no misconduct. They have behaved themselves well, unexceptionably well, when they find the government rescinding the contract made with them, refusing the stipulated price of their labour, dismissing them from service, and in order to cover this scandalous breach of faith, stigmatizing them with names which may render them odious to their countrymen. Is there a gentleman on the floor of this house, who would not revolt at such conduct in private life? Is there one who would feel himself justified, after employing a person for a certain time, and agreeing to pay a certain compensation, to dismiss the party from the service upon any caprice which altered his views, deny him the stipulated compensation, and abuse him with opprobrious names, for expecting the benefit of the engagement?

A bold attempt was made by one of the gentlemen from Virginia, (Mr. Giles) to force to his aid the statute of 13th Wm. 3d. I call it a bold attempt, because the gentleman had to rely upon his own assertion to support the ground of his argument. He stated, that the clause in the constitution was borrowed from a similar provision in the statute. I know nothing about the fact, but I will allow the gentleman its full benifit. In England at an early period, the judges held their commissions during the good pleasure of the monarch. The Parliament desired, and the King consented that the royal prerogative should be restrained. That the offices of the judge should not depend on the will of the crown alone, but upon the joint pleasure of the crown and of parliament. The king consented to part with a portion of his prerogative by relinquishing his power to remove the judges without the advice of his parliament. *But by an express clause in the statute, he* retained the authority to remove them with the advice of his parliament. Suppose the clause had been omitted, which reserved the right to remove upon the address of the two Houses of Parliament, and the statute had been worded in the unqualified language of our constitution, that the judges should hold their offices during good behavior, would not the prerogative of removal have been abolished altogether? I will not say that the honorable member has been peculiarly unfortunate in the employment of this argument, because, sir, it appears to me, that most to which he has had recourse, when justly considered, have operated against the cause they were designed to support.

The gentleman tells us that the constitutional provision on this subject was taken from the statute of William.—Will he answer me this plain question? Why do we find omitted in the constitution, that part of the statutory provision, which allowed the judges to be removed upon the address of the two branches of the legislature? Does he suppose that the clause was not observed? Does he imagine that the provision was dropt through inadvertancy? Will he impute so gross a neglect to an instrument every sentence and word, and comma, of which, he has told us was so maturely considered, and so warily settled. No, sir, it is impossible; and give me leave to say, that if this part of the constitution was taken from the statute (and the gentleman from Virginia must have better information on the subject than I have) that a stronger argument could not be ade, ced, to shew that it was the intention of those who framed the constitution, by omitting that clause in the statute which made the judges tenants of their offices at the will of Parliament, to improve in this country the English plan of judicature, by rendering the judges independent of the legislature. And I shall have occasion in the course of my observations to shew, that the strongest reasons derived from the nature of our government, and which do not apply to the English form, require the improvement to be made.

Upon this point, sir, we may borrow a few additional rays of light from the constitutions of Pennsylvania and Delaware, and of some other states. In those states it has been thought, that there might be misconduct on the part of a judge, not amounting to an impeachable offence, for which he should be liable to be removed. Their constitutions therefore have varied from that of the United States, and rendered their judges liable to be removed upon the address of *two thirds* of each branch of the legislature. Does it not strike every mind, that it was the intention of those constitutions to have judges independent of *a majority* of each branch of the legislature; and I apprehend also thst it may be fairly inferred, that it was understood in those states, when their constitutions were formed, that even two thirds of each branch of the legislature would not have the power to remove a judge whose tenure of office was during good behavior, unless the power was expressly given to them by the constitution. I cannot well conceive of any thing more absurd in an instrument designed to last for centuries and to bind the furious passions of party, to fortify one pass to judicial indebendence, and to leave another totally unguarded against the violence of legislative power.

It has been argued by the gentleman from Virginia, that our admission that Congress has power to modify the office of judge, leads to the conclusion, that they have the power to abolish the office. Because, by paring away in their powers they may at length reduce them to a shadow, and leave them as humble and as contemptible as a court of piepondre. The office of a judge consists of judicial powers which he is appointed to execute. Every law which is passed increases or diminishes those powers, and so far modifies the office: Nay, it is competent for the legislature to prescribe additional duties or to dispense, with unnecessary services, which are connected with the office of the judge. But this power has its bounds. You may modify the office to any extent which does not affect the independence of the judge. The judge is to hold the office during good behavior; now modify as you please, so that you do not infringe this constitutional provision.

Do you ask me to draw a line and say, thus far you can go on no farther. I admit no line can be drawn. It is an affair of sound and *bona fide* discretion. Because a discretion on the subject is given to the legislature, to argue upon the abuse of that discretion is adopting a principle subversive of all legitimate power.

The constitution is predicated upon the existence of a certain degree of integrity in man. It has trusted powers liable to enormous abuse, if all political honesty be discarded. The legislature is not limited in the amount of the taxes which they have a right to impose nor as to the objects to which they are to be applied. Does this power give us the property of the country, because by taxes we might draw it into the public coffers, and then cut up the treasury and divide the spoils? Is there any power in respect to which a precise line can be drawn, between the discreet exercise and the abuse of it.

I can only say therefore on this subject, that every man is acquitted to his own conscience who *bona fide* does not intend, and who sincerely does not believe, that by the law which he is about to pass, he interferes with the judges holding their offices during good behavior.

(To be continued.)

LONDON, *February* 22.

It has been rumoured that the negotiations will not be concluded so soon as was expected. Some new points have been advanced, and urged with unexpected firmness by the Dutch minister Schimmelpeninck, who is said to have distinguished himself in a very conspicuous manner by the depth of his information.

The point which he has brought forward relates, as might be expected, more to the commercial than to the political state of the Dutch republic. He has, it is said, claimed an indemnification for the Dutch East-India company's ships detained at the commencement of the war.

Some representations have also been made with respect to Ceylon, and to that article of the preliminaries which declares that the Cape of Good Hope shall always be free to the English, but be maintained at the expence of the Dutch Republic.

The cession of Louisiana to France has also been the subject of much discussion at the Congress, and, if we may give credit to our letters from the Hague, of considerable difficulty. But all the obstacles that have occurred will, we have no doubt, be removed, though the definitive treaty may not be signed so soon as was expected.

By letters from Dublin, of the 16th, we are informed of the liberation of JAMES NAPPER TANDY. He was brought from Lifford to Wicklow, circuitously, in a chaise and four, escorted by a guard of cavalry, avoiding all the large towns, the better to evade public notice. They travelled principally in the night. He arrived at Wicklow on the 15th, and was to embark next day, on board the Lovely Peggy, Captain Harris, for Bourdeaux. The order for his liberation is said to have been produced by the proceedings at Amiens. He was not suffered to communicate with any one, after the order arrived.

NATCHES, *February* 5.

GOVERNOR SARGENT.

Arrived on Wednesday the 17th ult. [illegible] for the information of those whom it may consern *here*, or, at the seat of the General Government, (it is thus publickly announced) received the most unequivocal testimonies of respect, esteem and affection, from the principal characters of this territory. His levee was *literally crouded* with visitors for two days, to the moment of his debarkation, demonstrating *that* gratitude for important services rendered to this territory, and a justice which has been so shamefully lacking in *those* whose sacred duty it is, to reward merit.

WASHINGTON, *April* 9.

In the debate on Monday, upon the resolution submitted by Mr. Griswold relative to the Berceau, the ministerialists made every exertion to prevent the passage of a resolution which would develope executive prodigality and the illegal appropriation of public money. Mr. Giles, with his "candour in pretence," and high sense of "responsibility to the people." Mr. S. Smith, attempting to state "matters of fact." Mr. Bacon with "specifice treasons." Mr. Randolph by slinging his *stones* again. Mr. Smilie with his ignorance, Mr. Nicholson, (not believing the gentleman from Connecticut, intended to quibble on this subject,) opposed, or rather evaded a decision—they acknowledged the right of the house, to all information, in possession of the Executive, which the public good might require, but it had no right to demand of Executive officers, an exposition of facts, which would tend to disclose their motives of action. Messrs. Griswold, Bayard and Dana, advocated the resolution, upon the principle, that an official knowledge of facts was necessary in order that the house might ascertain, whether the sums expended by the executive, were warranted by any legal appropriation. We are not suprised that the friends of the President should be desirous to conceal the *motives* which induced this wanton expenditure of the people's money.—The *action* itself, is a document explanatory that the Executive in the "*gestion*" of this business had not a due regard to the "fair responsibility of all public agents to the people"—hence his "constitutional adviser" (Mr. Giles, was the first to express his apprehensions) that the resolution would extend to the discovery of the 'motives.' It is indeed a delicate subject, it must would the sensibility of Mr. Jefferson (the man of the people) that he, from "*motives*" should have taken so much from the "earnings of labor"; but let him be consoled by the reflection," that in the opinion of his "*prime minister*," Mr. Giles, 'it is a paltry sum,' about equal to the salary of the sixteen disbanded judges—and surely a philosopher ought to know, that the people of America would prefer giving 28 or 30,000 dollars to president Buonaparte, for the benefit of the sister republic, than appropriate the same sum to pay sixteen judges for protecting their property and reputation, and rendering them justice at home.

The repairing of the Corvette Berceau, was one of the first executive measures, after Mr. S. Smith entered the navy-office, as acting secretary. All communications on this subject were withheld from his predecessor. Some 'matters of fact' will probably be disclosed, hereafter, which will elucidate and explain the '*motives*' of those who seem determined to keep "a view of the whole ground," within the knowledge of constitutional advisers only.

NORFOLK, *April* 3.

A gentleman who came passenger in the schooner Mary, Johnston, from Port Republican, has favoured us with the following particulars:

That on the 10th of March, a general action was fought at Petit Riviere, in which the Blacks were routed, but not without considerable loss on the part of the French, in which two general officers, Dessalx and Deveaux, were badly wounded; on the next day a great number of blacks were brought in prisoner, and the chiefs sent on board the Admiral's ship; the others sent to the forts to labour. Dessaline's army had been routed in the neighbourhood of St. Marc, and himself wounded by a ball through the body. The commandant of Leogane (who murdered all the whites at that place) had been taken prisoner and brought into Port Republican.

An American schooner, without sails, had been found between St. Marc's and the island of Gonaives, with a number of white inhabitants, who had been murdered at the time St. Marc's was burnt.

An American sloop which escaped from St. Marc's, was taken on her passage to Philadelphia, by a French frigate, Frenchmen put on board her, and ordered for Port Republican; in going in they ran her ashore, lost the sloop, but saved part of the cargo.

The mode of payment for property sold to the French, at that port, is one-fifth in

specie, two-fifths in produce at 30 days, and the remainder in produce at 60 days, or if preferred, bills on France or Holland, at 80 days sight.

By the schooner Good Intent, arrived yesterday, we learn, that General Boudet and Leclerc, have been also wounded, the former in the leg and the latter in the body.

NEW-YORK, *April* 12.

A letter was received in town on Saturday from Boston, dated the 5th inst. mentioning that the election in that town for Governor, &c. had terminated by a majority of upwards of *nine hundred* votes in favor of the Federal ticket. We hope the example of the patriotic Bostonians may be followed by the southern states. The change of sentiment in Massachusetts in favor of the good old principles of Federalism is highly pleasing; for, adds the letter, "the federal majority last year was only three hundred."

PHILADELPHIA, *April* 12.

Much uneasiness has be excited in Annapolis, Maryland, in consequence of certain movements among the negroes of that place. Arms have been given to the inhabitants, and a nightly patrole established.

SPANISH EQUITY.

We are credibly informed, in addition to the violences which have already been committed on American citizens and their property by the nation of Dons, that the following act of injustice recently occured:—An American schooner, the Manhattan, arrived at New-Orleans in the Month of March last, from Jamaica, and brought with her upwards of 4000 dollars in gold. The capt. reported it at the Balize, and was consequently obliged to enter it at New-Orleans, which he did by way of deposit, to be exported to Natchez. The gold was landed and delivered to the consignee. The following day an order was sent from the custom-house to the consignee requiring him to return the gold into the treasury. A few days afterwards the consignee applied for the gold having an opportunity to ship it; when to his utter astonishment, and that of every rational individual, they refused to deliver it, unless he would submit to a deduction of 3 per cent, which they called storage, a demand contrary to any thing ever heard of there, and unprecedented elsewhere!

MASSACHUSETTS ELECTION.

The returns of the Election in Massachusetts, for Governor, &c. as far as the result has been ascertained, are honorable to the federalism and activity of the citizens of that respectable state. In 62 towns there were for Mr. Strong, the federal candidate, 8709 votes—for his competitor, Mr. Gerry, 6722. This majority is more striking and flattering, when we recollect, that last year, the federal votes from the same towns amounted to but 7003, while those for the democratic candidate were 7318. This comparison proves that the pure principles of Washington and Adams so far from declining, have made a rapid progression in that state—maugre the artifices and violence of the jacobins.

It is stated, that the late President of the United States went to Boston to give in his vote for his co-patriot Governor Strong.

The New-York Daily Advertiser, of Saturday last, says—"By the ship Liberty, captain Mores, in 36 days from Liverpool, English papers have been received as late as the 28th February, when the definitive treaty was not signed.

We learn from New-Orleans, by Captain Sisson, that an embargo was to be laid upon all vessels in that port on the 12th of March, by order of the French government; and that a French commandant for New-Orleans was hourly expected.

Advices from New-Orleans, as late as the 30th ult. state, that the Small Pox had made its appearance in that place, with the most alarming symptoms of mortality. That city has not been visited by this disease for 14 years.

We learn by a gentleman from Virginia, that the College of William and Mary, at Williamsburg, is completely broken up, and the system of education there, for the present at least, entirely discontinued.

The circumstances of this extraordinary affair are as follows:—In consequence of a difference between two of the students, a Mr. Lee, of Norfolk, and a Mr. Yates, of Fredericksburg, a duel was fought, in which the latter was wounded. For this gross violation of the rules of the College, they were both expelled, which so enraged all the rest of the collegians, that they assembled, went to the church, broke and destroyed all the windows, cut down the pulpit, tore out all the leaves of the bible and gave them to the wind—from thence they proceeded to the house of Judge Tucker, (whose opinions have of late been so often quoted in Congress) professor of law in the University, broke all his windows, pelted his house, abused him, and then each repaired to his own home. The Judge, it is said, has resigned his office of Professor, in consequence of the outrage, and thus dies one of the oldest and wealthiest seminaries of learning in the United States of America. These may be considered as some of the blessed effects of the modern system of religion; for party politics, instead of science, appear long since to have been the primary objects of instruction in that University—and from that foul source have flowed many of the heretical doctrines of the present day."

(*N. Y. Evening Post.*

The Pittsburgh Gazette.

FRIDAY EVENING, *APRIL* 23, 1802.

The Judges of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania have appointed Circuit Courts to be held in the following Counties for the year 1802.

For Wayne County,	10th May
Northampton,	17th do.
Bucks,	25th do.
Chester,	31st do.
Delaware,	7th June
Montgomery,	14th do.
For Luzerne County	3d May
Centre,	11th do.
Huntingdon,	17th do.
Mifflin,	24th do.
Cumberland,	31st do.
York,	7th June
Lancaster,	14th do.
For Franklin County,	27th September
Somerset,	5th October
Fayette,	11th do.
Greene,	18th do.
Washington,	25th do.
Allegheny,	1st November
Westmoreland,	8th do.
Bedford,	15th do.
For Berks County,	4th October
Dauphin,	11th do.
Northumberland,	18th do.
Lycoming,	25th do.

ANECDOTE.

AN hungry Irishman, lately in London, mistaking a barber's shop for an eating house, bolted in, and begged to be served. The barber supposing from the length of his beard that he wished to be shaved, knocked up a bason of soap-suds, and placing it before him with a wash-ball, went backwards to set his razor. Pat, without waiting for grace, supped up the suds, and swallowed the wash-ball; and on the barber returning with the razor, his guest coolly observed, "There is no occasion for a knife, honey; your soup is very good, but your turnip was not quite boiled:" So paying his penny, he bade the astonished barber good morning.

TALL REGIMENT.

IN the reviews of his tall regiment, Frederick King of Prussia was frequently attended by foreign ministers. When the ambassadors from France, Spain, and England were present, he asked them whether an equal number of their countrymen would engage with these *gigantic soldiers!* The ambassadors of France and Spain answered the question in the *negative*, whilst the English ambassador, with a spirit characteristic of his nation, replied, "I cannot, Sir," said he, "take upon me to assert that an equal number of my countrymen would beat them, but this I think I may venture to affirm, that—HALF *the number would try!* !"

HARDENED VILLAINY.

A young man of nineteen at Bourdeaux, was lately convicted and executed for having murdered his aunt. Those who saw him between the time of his sentence and execution, give the following particulars respecting him: Having some knowledge of drawing, this young man amused himself with tracing on some pieces of paper the circumstances of the assassination; on one was delineated the posture in which he stood when he first struck his aunt; on another he drew himself knocking her brains out; in a third he represented himself on a sledge going to the scaffold.

All persons indebted to the subscriber are required to make payment on or before the last day of May next, and all persons having demands against him, are requested to prefer them for payment.

NICHOLAS BAUSMAN.

April 19, 1802.

Gabriel Dubac,

HAS removed his Store to the corner of Front and Market Streets, (where Wm. Boggs & Co. lately lived) and has on hand a variety of

MERCHANDIZE,

which he will sell at very reduced prices.

He requests all persons indebted or who have unsettled accounts with him, to come forward and make settlement before the first of June next. Those who neglect this notice must blame themselves for the consequences that will follow.

Pittsburgh, April 22, 1802.

One Hundred Dollars Reward

RANAWAY from the subscriber, living in Rockingham county (Virginia) in September last, a Negro Man named

DAVID.

He is about 5 feet 9 inches high, about 25 years of age, remarkably black, stout and well made; said negro is very impudent, and is well known in the Western Country by formerly driving a team of four black Studs; it is supposed that he has a forged certificate or pass as from the Clerk's office, describing him by the name of Jack. He had on and took with him a blanket coat, a blue cloth or coating sailor's jacket and one of coarse drab coloured cloth, a pair of negro cotton overalls and under jacket of the same. He was a great associate of a certain John Chapman, a white man, who has lost his left arm, and who absconded from the neighbourhood some time ago, it is therefore probable they may be together. The above reward and reasonable expences will be given for said negro if lodged in any jail, and information given thereof, or delivered to the subscriber.

JOHN CARTHRAE, jun.

Rockingham (Vir.) April 8, 1802. 3m

Sheriff's Sales.

BY virtue of sundry writs of venditioni exponas to me directed, out of the Court of Common Pleas, will be exposed to Sale at the Court House in the Borough of Pittsburgh, on Saturday the 8th day of May next, the following real estates, to wit.

Four hundred acres of land, with the appurtenances, on the Franklin road, adjoining the Donation Land. Seized and taken in execution as the property of James Douglass and Edward Douglass, at the suit of John Elliot.

Three hundred acres of land, on Pine creek, held in joint tenancy with Evan Cisna. Seized and taken in execution as the property of Emanuel Hoover, jun. at the suit of Jeremiah Barker.

A certain messuage and tenement, situate on the west side of the Monongahela river, opposite the mouth of Youghiogany river and M'Kee's Port, now in the possession of William Donaldson. Seized and taken in execution as the property of John Woffit, at the suit of Alexander Swan.

Two Lots or pieces of ground, No. 30 and 31, situate in Elizabeth town. Seized and taken in execution as the property of Caleb Brown, at the suit of David Furnier.

One Lot or piece of ground, No. 186, and tenements, situate in the town of M'Kee's Port, adjoining Second street, Blackberry alley, and Lot No. 185. Taken in execution as the property of Augustine Leabhard, at the suit of H. H. Brackenridge.

The dower in a tract of land of 285 acres, more or less, and tenements, adjoining M'Kee's Port, William Irwin, William Thompson, John Sherer, and the Monongahela river. Taken in execution as the right and interest of Susanna M'Kee, at the suit of H. H. Brackenridge.

WILLIAM WUSTHOFF, Sheriff.

Pittsburgh, April 20, 1802.

DAVID M'KIBBEN,

RESPECTFULLY informs the Traders in this Western Country, that he intends in the course of a few days to set out for New-Orleans. For several years past he has been engaged in trade to that place, and has still made it his study to become acquainted with whatever relates to that trade. He now intends to reside at New-Orleans, and hopes to be serviceable to his countrymen and himself by doing business on commission. Consignments of produce of every kind will be carefully attended to, and the products remitted agreeably to instructions. His charges will be moderate and always proportioned to the trouble. Should no accident happen him, he will be ready at New-Orleans for the reception of any boats that may start from this country, after the 1st of February next, or perhaps sooner. Those who will be pleased to favor him with their commands, may depend on the strictest punctuality and attention to their business.

Charlestown, January 1, 1802.

TO BE LET.

TWO *STORE ROOMS* and a *DWELLING HOUSE*, in Market Street, at present occupied by William Gazzam, Esq. and William Barratt. Apply to

ANTHONY BEELEN.

Pittsburgh, April 22d 1802.

BY THIS DAY'S MAIL.

NEW-YORK, *April* 14.

NEWS FROM GUADALOUPE.

Captain Hovey, 18 days from Guadaloupe, informs, that when he sailed, the troops of that Island were all under arms, hourly expected an attack from the French, whose landing they were determined to oppose at the point of the bayonet—That all the houses there were shut at dark, and a centinel placed at each door—that a well armed galley was moored at the Bar, to prevent the entry of the enemy—that all the American vessels had been robbed by the blacks of money and cloathing to a considerable amount—one brig (the Sally of Philadelphia) had 1500 dollars, besides other articles, taken from her in one night; that large sums had been offered to American captains to remain a few days, in order to take off the wealthy families of the island; that 2000 dollars had been offered to our informant, if he would remain two weeks, and bring away the effects of an American merchant of that place and that all was confusion and trouble there.

Late from the Mediterranean.

The ship Superior, Huggins, has arrived at Philadelphia from Marseilles and Gibraltar, left the latter place the 10th ult. Capt. Huggins informs, that by a letter from Consul O'Brien, it appears that five Tripolitan cruizers were out, had made no prizes that capt. H. heard of.

The frigate Prisident, Com. Dale, and the sch'r for Norfolk, sailed in company from Gibraltar, with the Superior, and parted 12th March.

Gen. Charles O'Hara, late Gov. of Gibraltar, died there on the 29th Feb.

PHILADELPHIA, *April* 16.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman of respectability at Kingston, Jamaica, dated the 28th of February, to his correspondent in Norfolk.

"A frigate arrived here three days ago with dispatches from Cape Francois to our Governor and Admiral, with the request of provisions for 20 sail of the line, 12 frigates, and 25,000 troops, and to give bills upon the Chief Consul; and also to allow all the line of battle ships to come into Port Royal for that purpose. I know not what answer they may get, but suppose it cannot be very favourable to them. We have a great fleet here now, say 19 sail of the line, 15 or 18 frigates, and 10 sloops of war, and 6 sail of the line and 2 frigates expected daily from England. I hope we shall not have a renewal of hostilities; the Admiral has given orders to our fleet to bring in any French line of battle ships within sight of Jamaica, but I hope their own good sense will induce them to keep at a distance.

It is said that twelve and a half dollars a barrel have been offered in Philadelphia for flour for the use of the French fleet, and refused. The market price was six and a half dollars at the same time. The motives for the refusal were alledged to be that the payment was to be made by Bills on the Consular government.

Aurora.

Accounts are received from Cape Francois to the 29th of March, by which we learn that a Corvette has arrived there, announcing that she had been dispatched by the Batavian fleet, which was then within 3 days sail of the Cape, having on board 7000 French troops destined to assist in the subjugation of St. Domingo.

INTERESTING INFORMATION.

Advices are this day received from the Havanna, which announce that the Court of Madrid have granted permission for the exportation of specie, free of duty, from the Spanish dominions, for the purchase of shipping. This information we derive from an authority, next of official.

The foregoing intelligence we presume is of considerable magnitude to the merchants of the United States; as in consequence of peace in Europe, we are in possession of a great surplusage of shipping, which hereby we shall be enabled to dispose of to advantage.

LANCASTER, *April* 19.

The agents appointed by the Governor to settle the accounts of the former and present county treasurers, are Matthew Hueston, Esq. Clerk of the House of Representatives of this state, and —— Maclay, Esq. son of citizen Samuel Maclay, the late *honorable* speaker of the Senate of Pennsylvania.

Wanted Immediately,

A Quantity of KNEES part square, and part unsquare, 5 feet long in the body and 3 feet in the arm, and 6 by 10 inches square, for which a good price will be given. Apply to

JAMES BERTHOUD, merchant, Pittsburgh.

March 11, 1802.

FRESH GOODS.

Now opening, and for Sale, by

JAMES BERTHOUD,
FRONT STREET,
WHOLESALE AND RETAIL,

AN extensive and general assortment of *Dry Goods, Groceries, Hardware, China, Queens and Glassware, Stationary, Paints, &c.*
Also, a variety of warranted
BOULTING CLOTHS.

Pittsburgh, 8th April, 1802.

The Subscribers have a quantity of the best

COFFEE,

on hand, which they will sell low by the Barrel, for Cash.

Jeremiah Barker & Co.

Pittsburgh, April 7, 1802.

The subscriber informs the public, that he has again commenced

Stocking Weaving,

in the Town of Pittsburgh, in the house formerly occupied by the Rev. Samuel Barr. He hopes from his attention to that useful branch of business in this Western Country, to merit the patronage of a generous public.

MATTHEW M'EOWN.

Pittsburgh, April 6, 1802.

FOR SALE.

IN the Third District of Pennsylvania Donation Land, Lot No. 57, containing 500 acres and allowance. This Tract is of the best quality for soil, timber and water; it is in a good settlement, and adjoins the land whereon Thomas Cannon, Esq. lives, on the main Shenango creek, which is navigable for fifty miles above said land. The terms of sale will be made known by applying to SAMUEL BOYD, merchant, Pittsburgh. March 30, 1802.

B. S. SPITZER & Co.

BEG leave to inform the Public, that they have lately arrived from Europe, and have opened a STORE in Market street, in front of Mr. William Irwin's house, where they have for Sale, all kinds of

DRY GOODS;

Wholesale and Retail, on the most reasonable terms.

Pittsburgh, December 23, 1801.

WILLIAM CECIL,

At his House in Liberty Street, near the Market,

MAKES and sells all kinds of Ladies Buck skin and Plush Saddles; Gentlemen's Plain, Burr, Spring, and Inlaid Saddles, and Bridles of all descriptions; Saddle Bags, Portmanteus, Veleces, Travelling Canteens, Holsters, Light Horse Caps, Fire Buckets, and every article in the Saddlery Line made in the neatest and most fashionable manner, and on the shortest notice.

He also makes Mattrasses of the best quality and on the most reasonable terms.

All kinds of Country Produce will be taken in payment for any of the above articles.

Pittsburgh, March 10, 1802.

N. B. The highest price given for Cow Tails and Horse Hair. Apply as above.

NEW GOODS,

A fresh supply, just received and is now opening for sale, by

WILLIAM CHRISTY.

Pittsburgh, 8th January, 1802.

Two Journeymen Taylors, who are capable workmen, will meet with employment and generous wages, by applying to

A. JAMIESON.

Pittsburgh, March 18, 1802.

To all whom it may concern.

THAT whereas a certain Mary Long on the 10th day of February last past, swore that she was pregnant, and that I was the father of the child she then bore, which was not agreed to on my part. However, I was taken by the authority and brought before John Riddle, Esq. of Washington county, and she the said Mary agreed in presence of the aforesaid 'squire, that if I would marry her that she the said Mary would give me an acquittal, and that she would never put me to any further trouble on that account, nor ask any support from me. Having complied with this demand made by her, I now forwarn all both great and small from trusting her any thing at all on my account from this day, as not one farthing of it I will pay.

WILLIAM COOL.

March 1st, 1802.

TO BE LET

For a term of Years, not to exceed Seven.

Sixteen Acres and a Quarter of Land, situate on Grant's Hill. Apply to ROBERT SIMPSON.

Pittsburgh, February 16, 1802.

Harrisburgh, (Penn.) February 1802.

PROPOSALS,

FOR PUBLISHING BY SUBSCRIPTION, AN

ABRIDGMENT
OF THE
Laws of the United States:
OR
A COMPLETE *DIGEST* OF ALL SUCH *ACTS* OF *CONGRESS* AS CONCERN THE *UNITED STATES* AT LARGE.

BY WILLIAM GRAYDON, *Esquire.*

SPECIMEN OF THE PLAN.

OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS.

Form of &c. to support the Constitution 1
To be taken by Members of Congress 2
——— *State Officers* 3
——— *all Officers of the U. States* 4
——— *of Office, to be taken, &c.* 5
——— *Witnesses, by whom administered* 6
Penalty on Swearing falsely 7

Act of June 1, 1789. (Vol. I. 25.)

1. Sect. I. The oath or affirmation required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, shall be be administered in the form following, to wit, &c. &c. [*Pursuing the section word for word.*]

2. Sect. II. At the first session of Congress after every general election of representatives, the oath or affirmation aforesaid, shall be administered, &c. &c.

3. Sect. III. The members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers of the several states, &c. &c.

4. Sect. IV. All officers appointed, or hereafter to be appointed under the authority of the United States, shall before they act in their respective offices, take, &c. &c.

5. Sect. V. The secretary of the senate, and the clerk of the house of representatives, for the time being, shall at the time of taking the oath or affirmation aforesaid, each take, &c.

Act of May 3, 1798. (Vol. IV. 102.)

6. Sect. I. The president of the senate, the speaker of the house of representatives, a chairman of a committee of the whole, or a chairman of a select committee of either house, shall be empowered to administer oaths, &c. &c.

7. Sect. II. If any person shall wilfully, absolutely and falsely swear or affirm, touching any matter or thing material to the point in question, whereto he or she shall be thus examined, every person so offending, &c.

CONDITIONS.

1. This work shall commence with the laws passed at the first session of Congress, held after the adoption of the federal constitution, and end with those that may be enacted at the present session.
2. The whole will be comprized in one large octavo volume of at least six hundred pages, & perhaps considerably more: it being impossible, till after the present session of Congress, to pronounce with accuracy.
3. It shall be printed on good paper and type and well bound, at FOUR DOLLARS No money will be required till the work is completed, of which notice will be given.—N. B. It is at present in considerable forwardness.
4. The Constitution of the United States shall be prefixed, & an Appendix added, containing all existing Treaties, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Rules and Articles for the government of the Army, and the Ordinance for the government of the Territory North-West of the Ohio.
5. Lists shall be given of the titles of all the laws under the the several heads of "Abridged"—"Repealed,"—"Expired or obsolete," and "Private or local." Likewise, Tables of the rates of Duties, Post Roads, & times of holding Courts throughout the United States.

The convenience of one book instead of six the difference of the price (being only *one-third* the rate of other editions) and the superior advantage of having all the laws upon each particular subject, classed together, and brought into one view, must appear striking and important; particularly as this work will be more within the reach of every one, and will comprize whatever his duty or interest requires him to know of the "supreme law of the land."

WILLIAM GRAYDON, *Editor.*
JOHN WYETH, *Publisher.*

☞ *Subscriptions will be received by* ZADOK CRAMER, *Bookseller and Stationer, and by* JOHN SCULL, *Printer, Pittsburgh.*

WILLIAM STEELE,

Has just received and opened at his Store, a handsome assortment of

Merchandize,

which he will sell at the most reduced prices fo Cash or approved of Country Produce.

Pittsburgh, December 22, 1801.

NEW GOODS.

Abner & Jesse Barker,

Have just received and are now opening at their *Store*, corner of Front and Market Streets, a large and general assment of

MERCHANDIZE,

consisting of Dry Goods, Groceries, Cutlery Hardware, Queensware, Stationary, &c. &c.

They still continue to keep, as usual, an elegant assortment of Superfine and Common

Boulting Cloths,

which are warranted good.

The above goods will be sold low for Cash or approved of Country Produce, *Wholesale and Retail.*

Pittsburgh, December 22, 1801.

N. B. They wish to contract for a *few hundred barrels Superfine Flour*, to be delivered by the first of March next, for which Cash will be paid

---

A New Seminary.

WILL be opened by the subscriber on *Monday* the 19th of April next, in Second Street, corner of Chancery Lane, where Youth will be instructed in the following branches of Literature, viz. Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Book keeping, English Grammar and Geography, Geometry and Trigonometry with their application to Mensuration, Surveying and Navigation.

A morning School will be opened at the same time to accommodate those who may find it inconvenient to attend at any other time.

The School Rooms are large and well lighted, and he hopes from a proper attention to business to merit the approbation of those who will place their children under his tuition.

For further particulars apply to

PHILIP GILLAND.

Pittsburgh, March 3, 1802.

N. B. A separate room will be prepared for the accommodation of Young Ladies.

N. B. To prevent the trouble of enquiry it is thought necessary to inform the public, that Reading, Writing Arithmetic, and English Grammar, will be taught at Three Dollars per quarter. P. G.

Young Messenger,

WILL stand to cover Mares, at the stable of the subscriber in the Borough of Pittsburgh, at the reduced price of Three Dollars and One Bushel of Oats the season, if paid by the first of October, but if not then paid Three Dollars and Fifty Cents, Six Dollars to insure a foal, and One Dollar and Fifty Cents the single leap.

Young Messenger is 6 years old this spring; seven-eighth blooded, full 16 hands high, a beautiful iron grey, with black mane, tail and legs, and for figure, bone and size not excelled by any horse. Young Messenger was got by the noted horse Old Messenger, whose stock have proved themselves, by the racing calienders, the best turf horses on the continent; his dam was bred in the state of Tennessee. It is thought unnecessary to puff his advertisement with any further comment, as all those who wish to put Mares to him will see his figure and discover his blood, and calculate by their Mares their dependance of a Colt for the saddle, turff or harnets. Good attendance will be given, and pasture provided for Mares from a distance.

JOHN REED.

March 27, 1802.

N. B. He will begin the season the 1st of April, and it will be considered over the 1st of August.

Thirty Dollars Reward.

RANAWAY from the subscriber on Tuesday the 16th instant, a Negro fellow named BOB, about 18 years old, 5 feet 6 or 7 inches high, has a scar on his left cheek, and a piece off one of his great toes; had on when he went away, an old drab coloured coat, jacket and breeches, and an Indian blanket. The said fellow has been seen with one William Jack, a packer. The above reward will be given to any person who will take up said fellow and commit him to jail, and necessary charges if brought home to the subscriber living in Berkely county, Virginia.

JEHU HARLAN.

February 28, 1802.

Just published and for sale at this Office,

An ALMANACK,

For the year 1802.

Country Storekeepers and others may be supplied

Allegheny County, to wit.

AT an Orphans Court held at Pittsburgh, for the said County, on the fourth Monday of March, anno domini 1802, before the Hon. Alexander Addison, Esq. President, and his Associates, Judges of the same Court.

On the petition of David Watson, administrator of the estate of William Caldwell, late of Pittsburgh, deceased, setting forth, that the personal estate of the said intestate is insufficient for the payment of his debts, as by the accounts certified by the Register appears, and that the said intestate died seized in his demesne as of fee of and in a certain Lot or piece of Ground, situate on Big Beaver creek, containing on the said creek 66 feet, and in length agreeable to the plot of the said Lot 140 perches or thereabouts, adjoining lots of Benjamin Herr and James Alexander, containing about one acre—Ordered, that the said Lot be sold on the premises on the first Saturday of May next, of which notice shall be published three successive weeks preceding in the Pittsburgh Gazette, and at least six notices set up in different places of Beaver county, at least ten days preceding the day of sale.

By the Court,

T. BATES, Clerk of Orphans Court.

PUBLIC NOTICE.

THE subscriber begs leave to inform his friends and the public, he has again commenced TAVERN KEEPING, in the house lately occupied by Mr. Samuel Ray, sign of the Black Horse, where travellers may rely on receiving every attention in the power of

EDWARD HALE.

Franklin, March 20, 1802.

N. B. He has also established a FERRY across French creek, opposite his house.

PUBLIC NOTICE.

WHEREAS Thomas G. Howard, of Baltimore county, state of Maryland, by letter of attorney bearing date the 19th day of December, in the year 1801, hath made, ordained, nominated and appointed me the subscriber, to be his lawful attorney, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of a certain quantity of land situate in the county of Allegheny, lying on and contiguous to the waters of Racoon creek, in the state of Pennsylvania, which said land was patented in the name of Francis Holland, these are therefore to forwarn all persons whomsoever from purchasing under any other authority, as only through me or my attornies at present any business can be legally transacted, respecting the premises—and whereas some purchases have lately been made of part of said land from other authority, the purchasers are hereby cautioned against paying over any property or money after the date hereof to any other person, as it will be at their risk—and I further have appointed SAMUEL PAXSON or THOMAS R. GREEN, of Connellsville, to receive any property or payments that are to be made for said land after the date, ratifying and allowing all lawful acts done by them or either of them touching the same.

Given under my hand the 1st day of March, 1802.

JOHN HOWARD,
of Baltimore County, Maryland

FARMER,

WILL stand to cover Mares this season at the stable of the subscriber, living on Grant's Hill, where Margaret Duncan formerly lived, at the low rate of Two Dollars and One Bushel of Oats the season, Four Dollars to insure a Colt, and One Dollar the single leap. The season will end the first of July.

Farmer is a beautiful grey, 7 years old, full 16 hands high, well made for the saddle or draft. It is needless to say any thing more of him, as his appearance will recommend him.

WILLIAM GIBSON,

April 1, 1802.

Whereas a certain William Rook pretends to claim a Tract of Land, situate in Butler county, Buffaloe township, adjoining lands of Benjamin Saviers, on the south, and John Hanshaw, on the north, which said Tract of land he is offering for sale. This notice is given to prevent any person from purchasing, as the title to said land is completely vested in the subscriber.

JEREMIAH SMITH.

March 23, 1802.

NOTICE is hereby given that the partnership of Baker and Heastings, Taylors, of the Borough of Pittsburgh, dissolved on the 29th of this instant, by mutual consent. All those that stand indebted to the said partnership, will when required, make payment to Robert Baker at his usual place of abode, and all those to whom the said partnership are indebted are requested to call on the said Baker for payment.

ROBERT BAKER.
JOHN HEASTINGS.

Pittsburgh, March 29, 1802.

N. B. Robert Baker begs leave to return his thanks to his customers and others for their past favours, and hopes, by his attention to business to merit a continuance, at his usual place.